

Democratization of Organizational Change Process through Deliberation

Abstract

Purpose: This paper examines deliberation in the context of organizational change and introduces an organizational jury as a change facilitator.

Design/methodology/approach: The research is based on an empirical study of four organizational juries that were organized by a non-profit organization in Finland. The main data of the study consists of a survey that the juries' participants filled in. The data is triangulated with observations of jury meetings and relevant documents including pre-jury information package, jury presentations and juries' proposals. In the analysis, the paper adopts deliberative democracy criteria to assess the inclusiveness, authenticity and consequentiality of the deliberative process.

Findings: The research findings suggest that the juries increased the inclusiveness of decision-making and the quality of deliberation about the changes among the employees. The results indicate that juries facilitated the change process by providing a means for information-sharing and building a shared understanding among the stakeholders. The main weakness of the juries was their low consequentiality.

Originality/value: Deliberative jury method provides a participative way to build and preserve socially shared meanings in an organizational change context. However, the studies on the use of deliberative forums in the organizational context are still scarce. Thus, the study provides an important addition to the existing research literature.

Keywords:

Case study, Democratic leadership, Deliberation, Organizational jury, Organizational change

Introduction

Organization is a form of life that emerges in the communicative activities that together construct organizational identity (Taylor and Van Every 2000). Therefore, any proposed change may be seen as a threat and a challenge to the existing perceptions that are built into an organization's social practices and norms (O'Neill & Jabri 2007). This increases the importance of communication as a

means of legitimizing perceptions of reality within an organizational setting. Communication plays a central role in motivating and sharing future goals and visions for the employees. However, simply “communicating” with employees does not easily alter perceptions (O’Neill & Jabri 2007). In practice, in many change efforts to increase participation, the stress is placed upon achieving consensus through utilizing rhetorics of persuasion (Jabri et al. 2008), or even manipulation (Raelin 2011a). Instead, change interventions should be aimed at creating shared meaning and understanding through genuine dialogue, where the terms of change are articulated, explained, and questioned (Jabri et al. 2008, 680).

This paper argues that the most genuine form of democratic dialogue is represented in deliberation. It can be considered as the most representative communication mode of democratic leadership, because it relies on the critical reflection as the means to involve the responsible parties in decision-making without privileging particular stakeholders over the others, because of their status or authority (Raelin, 2012b). Deliberation refers to a form of communication, where participants deliberate with each other and try to reach a reasoned agreement (Gutmann and Thompson, 1996). It gives attention to common interests and allows participants to transform their preferences through public and rational discussion (Cohen, 1997). Compared to other forms of communications, such as dialog and debate, deliberation is more oriented toward consensus and social co-construction (Bone et al., 2006).

There are different ways to promote democratic deliberation in the organizational change context. One is to establish special sites, where the members of the organization have an equal opportunity to take part in the deliberations and present solutions to problems (Gustavsen, 1992). In the change context, deliberative sites provide the employees with a chance to get information about the organizational change, deliberate about the change with each other and reach an agreement on solutions that are based on common interests. Incorporating deliberative aspects in an organizational change context can lead to more democratic change processes, where the employees have an influence on shaping the outcome of the change process.

This paper focuses on one deliberative method called organizational jury that adopts some features of the citizens’ jury method and applies them in an organizational context (Vartiainen et al., 2013; Lindell, 2014). The paper studies four organizational juries that were organized by a Finnish non-profit organisation (NPO). The paper adopts the criteria of deliberative democracy to study whether the juries managed to fulfil three core factors of a deliberative process: inclusiveness, the authenticity of deliberation and the consequentiality of the deliberative process. The results of the analysis will show how inclusive and deliberative the juries were and how they impacted the change process. The

paper will focus both on direct and indirect influences of the jury process to the organizational change process.

The structure of the paper is as follows: First, the paper presents contributions from the distributed leadership framework and discusses the limits of the framework in relation to democratic leadership. Secondly, the paper highlights literature sources from deliberative democracy theory and discusses how these theoretical contemplations could be merged with the democratic leadership framework. The paper presents an organization jury method as a deliberative site, where the change related issues can be discussed and various interests counterbalanced. In the final section, the paper introduces its research data and presents the main results of the data analysis. The paper concludes by discussing the implications for research and practice and sets stepping stones for future research.

From leadership to leaderful practices

Leadership studies have traditionally been leader-centred, i.e., focused on the traits, abilities and actions of the leaders (Wood, 2005). Individual leaders have been given a central place in enforcing principles, motivating, and communicating future goals and visions for the employees (Crevani et al. 2010). Because of this, unsuccessful change processes are often attributed to the management. For example, the management may fail to provide employees with compelling evidence of the benefits of the change, which may lead employees to be uncommitted to the change. In addition, a lack of communication or inconsistent messages can lead to misunderstandings of the aims and processes of the change as well as to rumours that demoralize employees. (Gill, 2002.)

During recent years, there has been an emerging interest in the field of leadership studies on notions of shared and distributed perspectives on leadership that emphasize leadership as a collective rather than individual activity (Raelin, 2012b). The resulting literature contains several conceptualizations of such arrangements, such as shared leadership (Bradford and Cohen, 1998; Pearce and Conger, 2003), distributed leadership (Gronn, 2002; Parry and Bryman, 2006) and relational leadership (Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011). What these notions have in common is that they move away from manager-centred thinking and toward relationships in a social context. Leadership is understood as a collaborative and collective responsibility, where the responsibilities of decision-making are distributed to several individuals rather than one individual alone (Crevani et al., 2010).

However, prior studies show that the form of distributed leadership tends to be bound by aims and values set by superior levels within the organization (e.g. Graetz, 2000; Woods 2004). While the form

of leadership is more interactive and open to social context, it still seems to be mainly centred in a manager's actions (Crevani et al., 2010; Raelin, 2012b; Lindell, 2014). Therefore, some scholars have recently focused on leadership practices, which are constructed in interactions and embedded in a social context of the workplace (Carroll et al., 2008; Crevani et al., 2010; Raelin, 2012b; 2016). In this sense, leadership-as-practice is less about what one person thinks or does and more about what people may accomplish together (Raelin, 2011b).

Raelin (2012b) argues that leadership-as-practice approach is distinctively democratic because it involves the members of the community in its development. In leadership-as-practice, the leadership arises from the social interaction among different parties. It is, therefore, a process of social construction that focuses on the processes shared meaning-making and reflection. "Accordingly, leadership is constituted through coordinated and random conversations and other communicative acts that convey the collective consciousness of the community" (Raelin, 2011b, pp. 198).

According to Raelin (2011b, pp. 200), the "orchestration of the dialectical process of public reflection" is a fundamental characteristic of leadership-as-practice approach. In a communicative process, the members of the organization engage to analyse, design and make decisions (Lindell, 2014). The communication becomes a multiple-party reflective conversation, through which people seek shared meaning and understanding (McArdle and Reason, 2008). O'Neill & Jabri (2007, pp. 573) have addressed that the social construction of change presents "a viable alternative for understanding and addressing the challenges encountered in the management of change". Involving those who are affected by the change is detrimental in building and preserving socially shared meanings in an organizational change context. The acceptance and adoption of new attitudes and actions by organizational members improve the likelihood of the successful organizational change process (O'Neill & Jabri, 2007).

Despite the continuing interest to leadership practices, there are only few examples of what these practices would actually consist of. The answer could be found from deliberative democracy theory, which has been the main development in democratic scholarship in recent decades (Goodin, 2008). The next section demonstrates that deliberative democracy theory presents a valuable resource for the democratization of the workplace practices.

Democratization of workplace through deliberation

The ideal form of deliberation is rooted in the Jürgen Habermas' (1996) rational discourse. In this view, deliberation implies a process where actors tell the truth, justify their positions extensively, and are willing to yield to the force of the better argument (Bächtiger et al., 2010). The goal of deliberation is to reach a shared understanding, or consensus. However, in response to “empirical turn” in deliberative democracy theory, there has been a shift away from the ideal rational discourse toward a conception of deliberation that incorporates alternative forms of communication. The “non-rational” form of communication may include elements such as rhetoric, humour, emotion, testimony or storytelling (Dryzek, 2009). Although these forms of communication do not correspond the ideal criteria of deliberation as such, they may still serve the communicative process by paving the way for more rational discourses.

In deliberative democracy theory, there are many definitions of what counts as deliberation. Most scholars agree that a deliberative process should at least be inclusive, authentic and consequential (Dryzek, 2009). The common approach to inclusivity is that participants should reflect the demographic characteristics of the population (Mansbridge, 2000). In contrast to this approach, a discursive approach focuses on ‘the range of interests and discourses present in a political setting’ (Dryzek and Niemeyer, 2008). This means that not everyone should participate in decision-making as long as one’s interests are represented during deliberation.

Authentic deliberation presupposes that participants have an ability to reflect on the considerations that are relevant to reaching collective decisions (Bohman, 1996). That is why participants should have equal access to relevant information (Gastil, 2008). In addition, they should have an obligation to provide “mutually accessible and acceptable reasons” to one another (Gutmann and Thompson, 2004). The deliberative process is supposed to be an open-ended dialogue, where participants reconsider their own arguments against others’ arguments. This means that participants do not try to hold on to their preliminary insights but are willing to be convinced by others and change their opinion. Most importantly, deliberative communication should not be affected by coercion, manipulation or other outcomes of unequal power structures (Dryzek, 2009).

Finally, a deliberative democratic process needs to be consequential. This implies that deliberation should make a difference, when it comes to determining or having influence on collective outcomes (Dryzek, 2010). The outcomes of deliberation can include explicit policy decisions, laws or other direct outcomes. In that sense deliberation can serve an instrumental role in decision-making, where it feeds important inputs to the decision-making process. On the other hand, sometimes the outcomes of deliberation can be more indirect and informal. Deliberation can help clarify and inform public

debate and provide information, insights, and skills in the course of engaging in the process (Dryzek, 2010; Mansbridge, 2015). In that sense, groups participating in a deliberative process will be in a better position to bring political pressure to decision-makers (Goodin and Dryzek, 2006).

The ideal procedure of deliberation can be best achieved in deliberative forums. These are specifically designed forums, i.e. mini-publics, where citizens can deliberate about issues that concern them. While the detailed processes of mini-publics are different from one another, they share some characteristics that distinguish them from other democratic innovations (see Smith 2009). To put it simply, mini-publics are designed to be small enough to be genuinely deliberative, and representative enough to be genuinely democratic (Goodin and Dryzek, 2006). Examples of mini-publics consist of deliberative polling, citizen juries, planning cells, consensus conferences and citizens' assemblies (Carson and Hartz-Karp, 2005; MacKenzie and Warren, 2012).

So far, mini-publics have mainly concentrated on public policy issues. However, the various positive features of the mini-publics can make them useful in different contexts, such as workplaces. Although the literature on deliberative forums in an organizational context is sparse, there are some important contributions (Lindell, 2014; Raelin, 2012b; Asif and Klein, 2009). At workplace, deliberative forums can be a source for democratization of the organizational change process, because they provide a platform where the members of the organizations can work together and produce comprehensive solutions to change related issues. Through the deliberative process, the challenges and possibilities of the change can be analysed, and costs and benefits of different policy options assessed. Thus, the deliberative process has the potential to lead to qualitatively better decisions.

At workplace, deliberation can work in two levels. First, it builds shared understanding about the surrounding world. When people deliberate with each other, they will learn more about themselves, their community, or about a particular issue (Raelin, 2012a). After that, people will be able to create a solution based on the shared understanding on the imminent issues that need to be solved. Through a deliberative process the motives for change can be made explicit for the members of the organization. The arguments in favour or against certain actions can be voiced, discussed and incorporated into the content and process of change (Lines, 2004). In that sense, deliberation advances the social construction of change, where the members of the organization build and preserve socially shared meanings of change (McArdle and Reason, 2008; O'Neill and Jabri, 2007). This improves the likelihood of the successful change process and the participant's commitment to the proposed changes.

In the following section, the paper studies the outcomes of four deliberative forums, i.e. organizational juries, in the context of organizational change. The paper adopts deliberative democracy criteria to assess how deliberation in juries corresponds to the ideals of the deliberative process. It is expected that when organizational members, who are affected by the change, consider that they have been involved in the deliberative process about the change, they are more satisfied with the outcome.

The case: Four organizational juries

The case organization is a nationwide NPO that focuses mainly on social work and civic education. The central organization supports and promotes the activities of its 34 regional and local associations. The central organization and the local associations employ more than 5000 professionals and volunteers. In 2014, the Board of the Organizations made a decision to merge all of the local associations that work in the field of child and youth work under four organizations. Previously, the local associations had been responsible for organizing their activities quite independently from the central organization. Now, the plan was that the local organizations would move under four mid stage organizations working directly under the guidance of the central organization. The goal of the change was that it would increase communication and co-operation between separate associations. Also, it would ease the evaluation of the performance and outcomes of the local child and youth work, and ensure that the work of the organizations would correspond to the strategic goals and values of the NPO more generally.

In order to allow the members of the local associations to have their say in the change plan, the Board decided to invite the members of the local associations to take part in four organization juries. The juries were held in four different locations. These areas were named after their physical location as the South, the East, the West and the North area. Each of the juries followed a fixed program, although there were some minor procedural changes. First, the Development Manager introduced the topics of the jury discussions. Then the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) presented participants background information about the organization change. The presentation included information about the organization, reasons for the organization change and possible consequences of the change process. During the presentations participants also had a chance to ask questions of the Development Manager and the CEO.

The jury adopted a sequential deliberative process, where the different deliberative sites fulfilled different deliberative virtues (see Goodin 2005). First, the participants deliberated in small groups of

four to six people. The mini-group phase offered the participants a chance to discuss about their personal experiences in a more informal manner. In the small groups, one of the organizers facilitated the discussions, while another organizer worked as a clerk and wrote down the discussion so that they could be later revised and processed. Later, in the final stage, all of the participants gathered together again for final discussions. During the final discussions, the outcomes of the mini-groups were presented and discussed. The goal was to integrate the outcomes of small groups into more canonical forms of argument in order to incorporate particular perspectives to more generalizable interests (see Bächtiger et al. 2010). Thus, the organizers urged the participants to come up with clear statements, which would be then collected in the jury's proposal.

In 2015, the Development Manager compiled the proposition draft that united all juries' proposals. The proposition included a list of statements covering the topic areas and grasping various aspects of the organizational change. The final proposition was handed to the Board of the Organization, which adopted it as a guideline for the organizational change. The new organization structure was implemented in the beginning of 2016.

Data and methods

The methods of the research consist of the survey on juries' participants, participant observation and a review of relevant documents. The preliminary data that was collected during the year 2015, when the survey was conducted (N=47). The survey included a list of questions about the participants' backgrounds, 22 multiple-choice questions and seven open questions, where the respondents could answer in more detail in their own words. The questions followed a survey instrument used in previous studies and cover the core factors of deliberative democracy (see Lindell, 2014). The participants had a chance to answer the survey right after the jury meeting or later through the online survey. The response rate of the survey was 78% (47/60).

The secondary data consists of notes from the juries' meetings and relevant documents of the organization change. These documents include the pre-jury information package, jury presentations, juries' proposals, as well as the final proposition drafts that were processed by the employees and the Development Manager. In addition, the Development Manager was interviewed after the jury process had concluded.

The data is analysed using the deliberative criteria framework that estimates inclusivity, authenticity and consequentiality of the deliberative process (Carson and Hartz-Karp, 2005). With regard to

inclusivity, the research adopts a modified approach that focuses on the quantity and the characteristics of the juries' participants. The main focus is on the occupational and demographical characteristics of the participants. In relation to authenticity principles, the study adopts a descriptive method to evaluate the deliberative process. The method includes a review of the information that was delivered to the participants, an evaluation of the deliberations during the group meetings and an overall assessment of participants' opinions about the jury process. Finally, the consequentiality of the juries was assessed through evaluating the changes in participants' attitudes toward the change. The research setting is summarized in Table 1, which represents the core factors of deliberative democracy. The table lists the variables of each core factor and the main data used to examine the variables.

Table 1: Analysis of the juries

The results

For the legitimacy of the organizational juries, it was important that the juries include participants from all of the local associations that were situated in the area. A high variation of participants would ensure that the jury's participants had enough knowledge about the local circumstances. On the other hand, it would restrain large associations, which had more members participating in the juries, to dictate the group discussions. The Development Manager thought that this goal was achieved fairly well and there were members from different local organizations taking part in the juries' meetings (see Table 2). However, the number of participants from different associations varied to some extent. For example, in the South, there were relatively more participants from one of the local associations than from others.

The number of jury participants varied significantly from jury to jury. One of the juries (West) only included nine participants, which is insufficient compared to the usual requirements of the municipalities (Goodin and Dryzek, 2006; MacKenzie and Warren, 2012, 95). Nevertheless, the demographical and occupational variation of the participants was fairly good despite the fact that the organizers did not do any selections among participants to make the juries as representative as possible. The estimation of juries' representativeness relies on the Development Manager, since there was no comprehensive statistics of the staff available when the research was executed. Unsurprisingly, the jury that had the most difficulty in meeting the inclusivity criteria was the West, which only had nine participants.

The authenticity of the jury process was highly dependent on the facilitators whose duty was to ensure that the discussions remain many-sided and that different viewpoints are heard. According to the survey answers, this goal was met quite successfully. On average, the respondents were satisfied with how the small group-discussions were facilitated. In the survey, almost 80% of the participants responded that they were completely or fairly satisfied with the facilitators and agreed or strongly agreed that the facilitators were neutral. Over 70% of the participants more or less agreed that they were treated equally and that the occupation of the participants did not have an effect on group discussions. Most of them also felt that they had an opportunity to state their opinions and that they were heard.

Table 2: Results of the survey

However, juries also proved to have some weaknesses with regard to the authentic deliberation criterion. One major deficiency of the juries, which undermined the quality of the discussions during the jury meetings, was a strict time schedule. In citizens' juries, participants should have a sufficient amount of time to familiarize themselves with the information they have learned, discuss with each other and reach an agreement (Crosby and Nethercut, 2005). In comparison to citizens' juries, the organizational juries were much denser, since they only lasted for a day. The organizers settled for a shorter period because they thought it might be difficult to get organization members to participate for a longer period. Consequently, the participants had only three to four hours to deliberate with each other. This caused time pressures, and therefore all discussion topics could not be deliberated satisfactorily. It was observed that sometimes organizers hurried participants to move on to next topics, even though the discussions were still on-going.

In order to save time and let the participant become familiar with change-related information before the jury meetings, the organizers sent the participants an information package that included information about the jury meeting and the organization change. The participants were also provided with more information during the short presentations by the CEO and the Development Manager. The organizers also discussed the possibility of inviting an outsider to provide information about some aspects of the jury's issues. However, it was decided that the best person to talk to the participants was the CEO, since he held most knowledge on change related issues and was thus able to answer to the participants' questions. Further, the members of the local associations were considered to be the best experts on the local change related issues.

Most of the respondents were satisfied with the information they were provided. On average, the respondents agreed that they were given enough information before the group discussions. On the other hand, 30% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. One reason for this may be that the preliminary presentation was held by the CEO and the Development Manager. This may be seen as natural since the management probably had the best knowledge about the state of the organization. However, the management's interpretations on certain issues may not be entirely objective. This is problematic if the participants feel that they are persuaded to adopt certain opinions and not to form their own opinions on the issues that are discussed.

The survey answers indicate that the participants' perceptions of the outcomes were mostly positive. Over 60% of the respondents were fairly or completely satisfied with the jury's proposal. On the other hand, in comparison to other juries, the reviews of the jury process and its outcomes were more negative in the North and the East. This discontent was reported in the survey, where one of the respondents thought that it was too late to ask people about their opinions, since 'all of the big decisions were already made' (East). Another respondent wrote that the jury's proposal 'should not have too much meaning' because it was 'not quite consensual' and did not 'genuinely represent' the common interests of the participants (North). One major reason for the participants' discontent was once again the strict timetable, which caused the discussions at the end of the day often to be hurried. The participants did not have enough time to discuss all of the topic areas and arrive at conclusions that would satisfy all of the participants. Consequently, some of the participants also thought that some important issues were left outside: 'Now it just feels that too many questions were left unsolved' (North).

Although the results of the juries proved to be to some extent doubtful, the jury process had outcomes that paved the way for a successful change. Through the jury process, the participants had a chance to get information about various issues and exchange their thoughts with the CEO and the other employees. In one survey response, the responder cited that the jury provided means for 'clarification' and 'invention of new ideas' (South). Another respondent reported that the jury 'set people on the same map' (South). In that sense the juries provided a stage where the employees and the management were able to form a common understanding of the change. Over half of the respondents (except in the North) agreed that they changed their opinion about the organization change during the jury meeting.

Overall, the participants' perceptions of the juries' outcomes proved to be mostly positive. The participants felt that the juries provided them a genuine chance to take part in the decision-making process and affect the organizational change: 'It (the jury) provided a chance to make your own voice

heard. A chance to make a difference' (West). 'It felt that there was a real chance to have an influence on things' (West). 'Every participant could influence decision-making' (East). These statements indicate that despite the difficulties during the deliberative process, the juries succeeded in providing a deliberative stage, where the members of the organization felt that their voices were heard.

Conclusion

The results of the study confirm the assumption that a deliberative method, such as organizational jury, can have a positive influence on an organizational change process. An organizational jury provides a stage where the members of the organization can take part in decision-making in a meaningful way. The deliberative process facilitates the change process and organizational development more generally both directly and indirectly. During the deliberation, the participants can express their views on various issues and problems and provide management with solutions and ideas that may have a direct impact on the outcome of the change process. In addition, the deliberative process can give the members of the organization a better understanding about change related issues and build a shared understanding about organizational goals and values more generally. This has the potential to increase the organizational members' commitment to the proposed changes (see O'Neill and Jabri, 2007).

The results demonstrate that the weaknesses of the jury process influence the participants' perceptions on the jury process and its outcomes. These limitations can undermine the outcomes of the jury process and question the jury's legitimacy altogether. Therefore, the practitioners need to take into consideration the needs of the current situations to evaluate whether the jury method is suited for the situations or not. The jury is a very demanding method requiring a lot of time and effort from both employees and the organizers. Especially, reaching an agreement on practical issues may be demanding and time-consuming, making the jury method a challenging method for solving these issues. This indicates that the jury process may be best suited in situations where the members of the organization are deciding on more abstract issues, such as setting goals and values of the organization. In these cases, the jury method can provide a means for creating common value basis and culture to the whole organization.

Since the data was collected in a single organization, there are some reservations to be made in relation to generalization of the results. It is expected that deliberative methods are best suited to environments that already share democratic and deliberative values (Felicetti, 2018). Such deliberative sensitive environments include NPOs, cooperatives and social enterprises, which are

created to further social purposes in a financially sustainable way (Doherty et al., 2014). In addition, there are innovative environments that acknowledge the benefits of shared leadership and utilize it in order to pursue both ethical goals and business goals. In these environments, deliberative processes would help organizations in furthering social well-being, while still creating profit for their shareholders.

Finally, the study has some limitations that need to be stressed. First, the method of the study is mostly descriptive. A more detailed evaluation of deliberative process would have given a better insight of argumentative process through which the change occurred (see Bächtiger et al., 2010). Secondly, the study did not include pre- and post-surveys to the participants. This means that the study relies on the subjective accounts given by the respondents themselves and the changes in the participants' attitudes could not be studied thoroughly. Thus, the study did not take into consideration how the entry positions of the participants affected the jury process (see Bobbio, 2010). Thirdly, since the study focused on the jury process, the actual impact of the organizational juries was not grasped in the study. Future studies should make a broader coverage of the outcomes by investigating how the jury process relates to other decision-making forums, how the jury's proposals are taken into account during the change process and how much the jury's proposals actually influence the upcoming changes.

References:

Asif, Z. and Klein, H.K. (2009), "Open and free deliberation: A prerequisite for positive design", *Information and Organization*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 186-197.

Bobbio, L. (2010), "Types of Deliberation," *Journal of Public Deliberation*. Vol. 6 No. 2, Article 1.

Bohman, J. (1996), *Public Deliberation: Pluralism, Complexity, and Democracy*. MIT Press. Cambridge.

Bone, Z., Crockett, J. and Hodge, S. (2006). "Deliberation forums: a pathway for public participation. In Petheram, R.J. and Johnson, R. (Eds.), *Practice change for sustainable communities: Exploring footprints, pathways and possibilities*, The Regional Institute Ltd., Beechworth, Australia, pp. 1-16.

- Bradford, D.L. and Cohen, A.R. (1998), *Power up: Transforming organizations through shared leadership*, Wiley, Chichester.
- Bächtiger, A., Niemeyer, S., Neblo, M., Steenbergen, M.R. and Steiner, J. (2010), “Disentangling Diversity in Deliberative Democracy: Competing Theories, Their Blind Spots and Complementarities”, *Journal of Political Philosophy*, Vol. 18, pp. 32-63.
- Carroll, B., Levy, L. and Richmond, D. (2008), “Leadership as Practice: Challenging the Competency Paradigm”, *Leadership*, Vol. 4, pp. 363-379.
- Carson, L. and Hartz-Karp, J. (2005), “Adapting and combining deliberative designs: Juries, polls and forums”, in Gastil, J. and Levine, P. (Eds.), *Deliberative democracy handbook*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. 120-138.
- Cohen, J. (1997), “Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy”, in Bohman, J. and Rehg, W. (Eds.), *Deliberative Democracy. Essays on Reason and Politics*. The MIT Press, London, pp. 67-92.
- Crevani, L., Lindgren, M. and Packendorff, J. (2010), “Leadership, not leaders: On the study of leadership as practices and interactions”, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol 26, pp. 77-86.
- Crosby, N. and Nethercut, D. (2005), “Citizens Juries: Creating a Trustworthy Voice of the People”, in Gastil, J. and Levine, P. (Eds.), *Deliberative democracy handbook*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. 111-119.
- Cunliffe, A.L. and Eriksen, M. (2011), “Relational leadership”. *Human Relations*, Vol. 64, pp. 1425-1449.
- Doherty, B., Haugh, H. and Lyon, F. (2014), “Social Enterprises as Hybrid Organizations”, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 16, pp. 417-436.
- Dryzek, J.S. and Niemeyer, S. (2008), “Discursive Representation”, *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 102 No. 4, pp. 481-493.
- Dryzek, J.S. (2009), “Democratization as deliberative capacity building”, *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 42, pp. 1379-1402.

- Dryzek, J.S. (2010), *Foundations and frontiers of deliberative governance*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Felicetti, A. (2018), "A Deliberative Case for Democracy in Firms", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 150 No. 3, pp. 803-814.
- Gastil, J. (2008), *Political Communication and Deliberation*, Sage.
- Gill, R. (2002), "Change management or change leadership?", *Journal of Change Management*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 307-318.
- Goodin, R.E. (2005), "Sequencing deliberative moments", *Acta Politica*, Vol. 40, pp. 182-196.
- Goodin, R.E. and Dryzek, J.S. (2006), "Deliberative Impacts: The Macro-Political Uptake of Mini-Publics", *Politics & Society*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 219-244.
- Goodin, R.E. (2008), *Innovating democracy: Democratic theory and practice after the deliberative turn*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Graetz, F. (2000), "Strategic change leadership", *Management Decision*, Vol. 38 No. 8, pp. 550-562.
- Gronn, P. (2002), "Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 423-451.
- Gustavsen, B. (1992), *Dialogue and development: Theory of communication, action research and the restructuring of working life*, Van Gorcum, Assen.
- Gutmann, A. and Thompson, D. (1996), *Democracy and disagreement*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Gutmann, A. and Thompson, D. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton University Press, Princeton, NY.
- Habermas, J. (1996), *Between Facts and Norms*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Jabri, M., Adrian, A. and Boje, D. (2008), "Reconsidering the role of conversations in change communication: A contribution based on Bakhtin", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 21 No. 6, pp. 667-685.

- Lindell, J. (2014), "Fostering Organizational Change through Deliberations: The Deliberative Jury in a University Setting", *Tertiary Education and Management*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 30-43.
- Lines, R. (2004), "Influence of Participation in Strategic Change: Resistance, Organizational Commitment and Change Goal Achievement", *Journal of Change Management*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 193-215.
- McArdle, K.L. and Reason, P. (2008), "Action research and organization development", in Cummings, T.G. (Ed.), *Handbook of Organization Development*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, pp. 123-136.
- Mackenzie, M.K. and Warren, M.E. (2012), "Two trust-based uses of minipublics in democratic systems", in Parkinson, J. and Mansbridge, J.J. (Eds.), *Deliberative Systems: Deliberative Democracy at the Large Scale*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 95-124.
- Mansbridge, J.J. (2015), "A Minimalist Definition of Deliberation", in Heller, P and Rao, V. (Eds.), *Deliberation and Development - Rethinking the Role of Voice and Collective Action in Unequal Societies*, The World Bank, pp. 27-50.
- Mansbridge, J.J. (2000), "What Does a Representative Do? Descriptive Representation in Communicative Settings of Distrust, Uncrystallized Interests, and Historically Denigrated Status", in Kymlicka, W. and Norman, W. (Eds.), *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 99-123.
- O' Neill, A. and Jabri, M. (2007), "Legitimation and group conversational practices: Implications for managing change", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 28, pp. 571-588.
- Parry, K.W. and Bryman, A. (2006), "Leadership in organizations", in Clegg, S.R., Hardy, C., Lawrence, T.B. and Nord, W.R. (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organization studies*, Sage, London, pp. 447-478.
- Pearce, C.L. and Conger, J.A. (2003), *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership*, Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Raelin, J.A. (2011a), "The end of managerial control?", *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 135-160.

Raelin, J.A. (2011b), "From leadership-as-practice to leaderful practice", *Leadership*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 195-211.

Raelin, J.A. (2012a), "The manager as facilitator of dialogue", *Organization*, Vol. 20 No. 6, pp. 818-839.

Raelin, J.A. (2012b), "Dialogue and deliberation as expressions of democratic leadership in participatory organizational change", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 7-23.

Raelin, J.A. (2016), "Imagine there are no leaders: Reframing leadership as collaborative agency", *Leadership*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 131-158.

Smith, G. (2009), *Democratic Innovations: Designing Institutions for Citizen Participation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Taylor, J.R. and Van Every, E.J. (2000), *The Emergent Organization: Communication as its Site and Surface*. Routledge.

Vartiainen, P., Ollila, S., Raisio, H. and Lindell, J. (2013), *Johtajana kaaoksen reunalla, kuinka selviytyä pirullisista ongelmista?* Gaudeamus Helsinki University Press, Helsinki.

Wood, M. (2005), "The Fallacy of Misplaced Leadership", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 42 No. 6, pp. 1101-1121.

Woods, P.A. (2004), "Democratic leadership: drawing distinctions with distributed leadership", *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 3-26.

Table 1: Analysis of the juries

	Variables	Main data
Inclusivity	Occupation of participants	Interview
	Demographical characteristics	Survey, interview
Authenticity	Quality of information	Survey, documents
	Quality of deliberation	Survey, observation
Consequentiality	Change of opinion	Survey

Table 2: Results of the survey

	South	East	West	North	All
Inclusivity					
Total participants	17	16	9	19	60
Organizations represented	10	9	5	8	32
Senior staff/employees	10/7	9/7	3/6	7/12	29/31
Survey responders	14	13	9	11	47
Male/female	9/5	7/6	1/8	5/6	22/25
Age under 29/over 30(empty)	1/13	8/4(1)	3/6	4/7	16/30(1)
Time in the organization less than 5 years/more than 5 years	4/10	8/5	6/3	4/7	22/25
Authenticity (N=47)					
<i>I got enough information before group discussions</i>	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
<i>The occupation of the participants did not affect group discussions</i>	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Agree
<i>All of the participants were equal</i>	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Agree
<i>I had an opportunity to state my opinion</i>	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
<i>I am satisfied with group facilitators</i>	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
<i>Group facilitators were neutral</i>	Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
<i>I am satisfied with jury's proposal</i>	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Agree
Influence (N=47)					
<i>My understanding about the organization reform changed during the jury process</i>	Agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Agree